THE NAUTILUS.

described form, but too imperfect for characterization. Mr. Woolman writes me that the locality from which these specimens were obtained has yielded upward of sixty species of Molluscan remains, which is rather more than that obtained from any one locality within the State, from this bed, so far as I know.

DESCRIPTION OF A NEW SPECIES OF CYPRÆA.

BY JOHN FORD.

In the description of *Cypræa cruenta* Gmel. var. *Greegori* Ford, published in the NAUTILUS for Feb., 1893, it was suggested that most conchological students would probaby have made *Greegori* a species instead of a variety. It may at once be said that the writer of that description is now fully convinced of the specific distinction of the latter, and has therefore decided to alter the name from *C. cruenta Greegori* Ford to *C. Greegori* Ford. Under the circumstances such a



change will doubtless meet with some opposition. Nevertheless, I have no hesitation in making it, inasmuch as my conclusions are chiefly based upon the careful study of some fifty specimens secured by me since the description referred to was written.

These are of various sizes and stages of growth, yet all of them can be readily separated from any other species belonging to the genus, though in exceptional instances the heavy callus on the sides and ends is creamy white and the typical blotches scarcely discernable. The larger portion of my former description may be profitably retained, but as it is desirable to make a few additions it is reproduced here with these included. Cypræa Greegori Ford, n. sp.

Shell depressed, orbicular oval in form, callus on the sides and ends remarkably thickened. That on the sides light salmon in color, with irregular purple-brown spots, having a blotchy appearance. Dorsal surface similar to that of *cruenta*, but lacking the whitish spots typically present in that species. Base semi-translucent, spotless, dark buff or salmon colored, darkest in the interstices. Teeth on outer lip very strong, long and whitish; on inner lip finer, with exception of the anterior fold and one or two adjacent teeth, the first of these latter being very prominent and notably transverse. Space between the anterior fold and the following tooth wide and brightened; posterior teeth of inner lip prolonged outward upon the base. Dimensions of average specimen: length 1[‡], breadth [‡] inch.

That C. Greegori is more nearly related to C. cruenta than to any other species, I have no doubt. But it is equally true that the former possesses several characters altogether distinct from those belonging to the latter. For instance, C. greegori is more translucent, more rugged, much smaller and rounder in form, different in general color, and in the peculiar variations of the teeth, also in the remarkable thickness and brilliancy of the callus with which it is rimmed.

With the probable exception of one poor specimen, this shell was unknown to the late Mr. Tryon, and for the same reason, perhaps, it was not noticed in Mr. Robert's catalogue of the species. Nevertheless, an excellent figure of it was published by Kiener¹ who merely referred to it as a variety of *C. cruenta* (variolaria). A figure, *possibly* intended for the same shell, was also published by Sowerby² who seems to have considered it a variety of *C. caurica*. More recently, Sowerby's figures were alluded to by Mr. J. C. Melvill³, as the var. *coloba*, but whether this variety was referable to *C. cruenta* or *C. caurica*, seems to have been a question that he was either unable or unwilling to decide. At least, in one sentence he apparently makes *C. cruenta* responsible for its parentage, while in another sentence the same honor is given to *C. caurica*. Verily it seems that even the babes in "Pinafore" could not have been more hopelessly mixed than were these poor little waifs.

4

40

¹ Iconographie Coquilles Vivantes, Page 57, pl. 27, fig. 3.

² Thesaurus Conchyliorum. Plate 23, fig. 190.

³ 1st Vol. 4th series of Memoirs and Proc. of the Manchester, (Engd.) Lit. and Phil. Society, 1887--8.

So far as I am aware, no description of the shell, previous to my own, has been published; and unless proof of such publication is shown I shall claim priority both for the name and description. This claim has especial reference to a criticism of the name applied to the shell in my former article.

It might be well to add that the incipient tooth in the interstice next to the anterior fold, as shown in the figure published in THE NAUTILUS for April, 1893—is not typical, since it is discernable in less than five per cent of the specimens, and very slightly in them. In a hurried selection of the specimen for drawing purposes, this very minute protuberance was unobserved by me. Otherwise it would not have been drawn. This error has been corrected in the figure accompanying this article.

BEACH SHELL COLLECTING IN CONNECTION WITH A STUDY OF OCEANIC PHENOMENA.

BY MRS. M. BURTON WILLIAMSON.

It has often occurred to me that a shell collector who is something of a physicist, having a love for historical facts, could furnish interesting data in regard to shore collecting under certain physical conditions of the ocean. Few amateur collectors note the historical. or rather chronological appearance of genera and species collected by them, they are usually satisfied with obtaining a "good find," but time and seasons are hardly observed, certainly not studied as furnishing data for future reference. A storm is hailed as a precursor of "rare finds," but a study of the storm with notes in regard to it, accompanied with a list of shells found after such a storm are too frequently neglected by collectors. Mollusks are collected too often as a miser collects his money, as a mania, not as a medium for an intelligent study of Nature. It seems to me, that a study of mollusks thrown upon the shore from other areas, in connection with a study of the physical condition of the ocean at such times, would be very helpful to the collector, although of no value to science. It may be urged that shells cast up by the sea are merely "happen-